had been made at the commencement of the session with regard to the seating accommodation to Congress members. He wanted that as on the first day a separate block should be earmarked for the members of the Congress Party and a board also put up to indicate that that block was reserved exclusively for the members of that party.

The PRESIDENT replied that the arrangements for accommodation would be improved, but that it was not usual in the case of Houses of Legislature to put up placards to indicate that particular seats were reserved for particular groups.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—*contd.*

Bifurcation of the Mysore District Board.

Q.—14. **Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA,** Gundlupet Taluk.—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) the period for which local bodies are usually constituted;

(*b*) when was the Mysore District Board constituted;

(*c*) have not the Government already announced that the present term of the Mysore District Board is to be terminated on 1st September 1938?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT (Mr. P. H. Krishna Rao).**—

(*a*) Three years.

(*b*) The Mysore District Board was reconstituted for a period of three years from 1st September 1936.

(*c*) Yes, but Government have since issued orders that the bifurcation of the Mysore District Board will come into effect from 1st September 1939 instead of from 1st September 1938 as previously ordered. (*Vide* Notification No. L. 8580/L.B. 102-37-4, dated 19th April 1938).

Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA.—It is not clear from the answer why the term of the district board was ordered to be terminated earlier than the prescribed period.

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—It is competent for the Government to do so under the District Boards Act.

Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA.—May I know under what section of the Act, the Government had taken action?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—Notice.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Has not the section of the Act dealing with the termination of the term been mentioned in the order?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—It might have been, but the order is not in my hands just now.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA.—Once the term of office of the board has been prescribed as three years, is it open to the Government to order its termination earlier?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—The Act says that the term of the board shall "ordinarily" be three years.

The SECOND MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau).—When the district board itself is bifurcated, it ceases to exist and the members no longer continue.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG.—After passing the order under reference, did not the Government notify fresh elections and also call for separate voters' lists from each taluk?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—Government did not issue any notification. The Deputy Commissioner did it.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG.—Why, then, elections were not held?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—On reconsideration, it was thought unnecessary to hold the elections.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG.—Why should the question have been reconsidered at all? Does it mean that the case had not been considered fully when the order was issued?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—At the time the order was issued, it was considered necessary to hold the elections; but subsequently, it was found to be inexpedient.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Is it not a fact that under the Act the Government have power, if at all, to extend the term of office of a district board and not to reduce it?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—When the term prescribed is ordinarily three

years, it shows that under special circumstances, as in the case of the bifurcation of the Board itself, it is open to the Government to reduce it also.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Do the Government grant that they had no authority to reduce the term?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—It is a matter of opinion.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—What special considerations prevailed with the Government to reconsider their own order within so short a time as one month?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—Government thought that as the district board was unwieldy, bifurcation was necessary. The question when such bifurcation should take effect was a subsidiary matter.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Was the reconsideration of the original order due to a realization on the part of the Government that the order was opposed to the provision of the Act?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—No.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Did any deputation wait on the Secretary to Government or the Member of Council to represent that the decision of the Government would result in considerable inconvenience to the public?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—There was a deputation who represented that it would cause inconvenience to the public. It was a matter of expediency.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—The voters' lists were prepared at a heavy expenditure. If those lists were now to be thrown into disuse, who is to be held responsible for that heavy expenditure?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—The lists will be useful when elections are thought of next.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Will not several changes become necessary in those lists?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—The lists will have to be revised every time. That is a matter which cannot be helped.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Was a report received from the Deputy Commissioner that re-elections need not be thought of just now?

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO.—I cannot say.

Limiting the Length of the Barrels of Guns.

Q.—15. **Mr. R. P. RAJANNA,** Goribidnur Taluk.—

Will the Government to pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that rules have been framed to limit the length of the barrels of guns to 12 inches;

(*b*) if not, the reason for issuing orders for limiting the length of the barrels as above;

(*c*) whether they are aware that there is danger in the use of such short length barrelled guns;

(*d*) in how many cases have the length of the barrels of these guns been compulsorily cut like this in the State;

(*e*) the percentage of loss in the value of such guns whose barrels are cut;

(*f*) the amount of loss sustained by the raiyats on this account;

(*g*) how many such guns, whose barrels are not cut, are under *amanath*;

(*h*) how they have been disposed of?

A.—**The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. H. V. Ramaswami).**—

(*a*) No rules have been framed under the Arms Act. But instructions have been issued by Government in this behalf. In the first order, Government directed that free licences should be issued for muzzle loaders with barrels of not more than one foot in length. In the second order, instructions were issued that barrels should be cut without rendering them ineffective and that while issuing licences in Form No. XI (licence for destruction of wild animals doing injury to crops, cattle, etc.) in future, the length of the barrel should be prescribed as 12 inches.

(*b*) The order was issued with a view to prevent indiscriminate destruction of game.

(*c*) There is no danger.

(*d*) Only one.

(*e*) It depends upon the original value of the weapon. There will be little or no loss since such weapons are